



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The Harlem ship canal, connecting the waters of the Hudson and the East rivers at New York, was thrown open on the 17th of June. It is six miles long, fifty feet wide and nine feet deep, and thus capable of letting ships of light draught pass through. It has cost two and one half million dollars. It is ultimately to be widened to three hundred and fifty feet and deepened to eighteen.

A treaty of commerce has been signed between Russia and Japan, to go into force four years hence. It is similar to the treaties recently made by Japan with Great Britain, the United States and Italy.

#### PROCEEDINGS OF THE MOHONK ARBITRATION CONFERENCE.

As announced in our last issue, a Conference called for the purpose of promoting public sentiment in favor of the settlement of international difficulties by arbitration met at Mohonk Lake, N. Y., on the 5th, 6th and 7th of June. All of the members of the Conference had been invited by Mr. Albert K. Smiley and his wife and as their guests were entertained during the time of its meetings, three days, at their beautiful Mountain House. The weather was perfect most of the time and, as sessions of the Conference were held only in the forenoon and evening, the afternoons were given up to rowing on the lake or to drives and walks amid the splendid scenery about lake Mohonk and lake Minnewaska. However war-like any of the guests may have felt on their arrival, they all were perfectly subdued and peaceful before the three days were over. The cause of peace and arbitration could not help thriving on such treatment as it received at the hands of Mr. and Mrs. Smiley.

#### FIRST SESSION.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, JUNE 5.

In welcoming his guests, Mr. Smiley explained that he had for many years desired to bring about such a Conference. At the advice of friends, conferences on other subjects had been held instead. He believed that the time had now come when important results might be reached by the meeting together of persons of sound convictions, strong opinions and a desire to do good. It was his wish that the deliberations of the Conference should be limited to the subject of international arbitration, or the devising of practical means for the settling of international disputes. All were convinced of the horrors of war and on that subject there would be no need of discussion. The doctrine of "peace at any price" he also did not wish taken up, as on this there would be no agreement of opinion. He desired first of all that our own nation might be able to find a way of settling all her disputes with others by peaceable means, and then induce all others to join her as rapidly as possible. After expressing the wish that, as in the Indian Conferences, the spirit of Christian kindness with frank expression of opinion might prevail in this, he nominated as Chairman of the Conference Mr. John B. Garrett of Philadelphia, who was unanimously elected.

#### PRESIDENT'S OPENING REMARKS.

MR. GARRETT said on taking the chair that he should enter upon the duties of the position with great reluctance but for the fact that he should be sustained by the unity of purpose of all present. He hoped for great things from the Conference. There never was a more opportune time than the present for considering the issues before us. The work is a permanent, perpetual one so long as sin and contention remain. The cause of humanity and righteousness owed a deep debt of gratitude to their host, whose breadth of view and large heartedness in calling the Conference all must appreciate.

On many branches of the subject of peace there was wide difference of opinion. The subject of how international difficulties are to be settled, on which there was most agreement, would claim the chief attention of the Conference. He hoped the tendency to increase armaments in this country, in imitation of the policy of Europe, would not be overlooked. We ought not to be blind to the increasing spirit of "Jingoism" which had steadily grown since the inception of the Hawaiian difficulties. This was due in part to political jealousies, in part to the fact that we have covered our continent. There is the same ambition on the Pacific as on the Atlantic coast. The people on the southeast were looking askance at Cuba, those on the Pacific coast at the islands to the west. On the north there was a feeling that Canada might as well be brought in, by force, if necessary. He regretted all this, and hoped something might be done to check the growth of this grasping spirit.

#### ORGANIZATION OF THE CONFERENCE.

At the close of the Chairman's remarks, Mr. Marshall H. Bright of New York and Miss Martha D. Adams of Boston were chosen secretaries and Mr. Joshua L. Baily of Philadelphia treasurer. A Business Committee was chosen consisting of Dr. Austin Abbott of New York, Rev. George Dana Boardman of Philadelphia, Philip C. Garrett of Philadelphia, President Merrill E. Gates of Amherst and Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood of Boston.

#### REMARKS OF BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD.

BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, having been asked to give some account of what had already been done in peace work and an outline of what this Conference could wisely undertake, said that the great movement for peace among the nations had recently been organizing itself rapidly along many lines. The peace society movement which originated in 1815 had so developed in late years that there were now nearly three hundred peace associations of different kinds. The peace congress movement which began in 1843, after ceasing in 1852 for a time, had since 1889 become a permanent one. This congress gathered together yearly leading peace men from all the civilized nations. The subject of international arbitration received a large share of the attention of the peace societies and the peace congresses. He gave an account of the origin and development of the Interparliamentary Peace Union in Europe which now had a membership of 1200 from the different parliaments of Europe and was doing a great service in breaking down ill feelings between the Continental nations.

One of the most interesting phases of the peace movement was the effort to secure a permanent treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain. This movement had gone so far and the realization of this

treaty was so important that this Conference ought to throw the whole weight of its influence in favor of its speedy realization. The people of the United States were so far removed from the strifes and enmities of the old world that they had fallen into carelessness about them and needed to be aroused to a sense of their duty.

Mr. Smiley had done wisely in limiting the deliberations of the Conference to the subject of international arbitration. This was a subject on which all present could agree. Furthermore the peace movement had passed its sentimental stage and had reached that of practical means. The purpose of this Conference was to help to concentrate the large public sentiment already existing against war.

International arbitration he said was an outgrowth of the spirit of internationalism which had been growing up during the century. The nations were beginning to feel that they are members one of another. They were co-operating more and more through treaties of commerce, etc. An international conscience was forming. Diplomacy once meant the art of getting nations into war, now it meant the art of peaceful co-operation.

The history of the application of arbitration to the settlement of international disputes during this century was a very instructive one. Nearly eighty important cases had occurred only three or four of which were known to most people. The newspapers gave scanty notice of them. One war made more noise than a hundred arbitrations and cost more than a thousand. The United States had led in this matter with about forty settlements. The cases thus adjusted covered every kind of difficulty arising between nations. It was proposed to crystalize into law what was the actual practice of the United States.

The subject of an international tribunal, about the feasibility of whose establishment there was some difference of opinion among jurists, would come properly within the discussions of the Conference. So would the subject of international treaties, and especially of the proposed treaty between this country and Great Britain with which the close of this century ought to be crowned. The Conference might also very properly give some attention to the difficulties in the way of arbitration between nations, and how they could best be removed.

#### REMARKS OF REV. GEORGE DANA BOARDMAN, D.D.

DR. BOARDMAN being introduced said that the healing processes, the vital forces, were slow and quiet; the destructive forces—the avalanche, the earthquake, the tornado—were noisy. Who ever heard a baby or a tree grow? The lightning which rives the tree was salvoed by the thunder. The sunlight which makes it grow was silent. We little knew what we were to accomplish in a Conference like this. We might bless God for this inauguration of another branch of his kingdom.

There were almost as many theories of society as there were thinking individuals in the world, but all might be reduced to two. The one was the mechanical theory, which conceives of society as a human organization managed by men. Those who held this theory very naturally resorted to molecular arguments and apparatus. The other was the biological theory which conceives of society as a divine organism to which it is our duty and privilege to conform our opinions and actions. He was persuaded that we were met in this Conference in the conviction that society was more than a human organiza-

tion, that it was rather a divine organism and that it was our humble purpose to adjust ourselves, with the means within our control, to what was an ideal conception of our Creator.

#### ADDRESS OF DR. AUSTIN ABBOTT.

DR. AUSTIN ABBOTT was then called upon. He said that a large subject had been laid out, and it would be useful to suggest some interrogation points, as they were all learners. Arbitration was now a question of practical politics, as already stated. The sentiment of the intelligent world, especially of the English-speaking nations, was ready to be guided into practical measures. The practicability of arbitration had been demonstrated. The history of the development of law had been the history of the substitution of reason for brute force.

Moses who killed the Egyptian whom he saw smiting a Hebrew, when he came to rule the Hebrews, restrained the "wild justice" of revenge by allowing only "an eye for an eye," or smiting for smiting. Christ went further. The progress of law had been along the same line. The passions are held in check till reason can speak. International arbitration proposes the same thing in reference to nations. The problem is difficult because international passions are strong and thousands, millions of men are enlisted in support of them.

The income-tax case in this country had wonderfully demonstrated the power of judicial reason. After giving a statement of the progress of the case and its conclusion, he said that millions of people had submitted to the decision and thus shown their confidence in the decisions of reason.

The first obstacle in the way of arbitration between nations was the love of contention. As in prize fighting, so in national controversies, many people wanted the contention for its own sake. This love of contention was strong, but was gradually being silenced. The material interests enlisted in behalf of military movements constituted another obstacle. If war breaks out the soldier has increased pay and prospect of promotion. Certain branches of trade are also stimulated by a war. Still further, military life, especially in the old country, is an important condition of social recognition. We must consider the weight which these obstacles have in retarding the progress of pacific measures.

Between the United States and Great Britain these obstacles are evidently less potent than between France and Germany, for instance. We have happily grown up free from the persistent and long continued antagonisms of European nations. The love of contention is strong in all uncultured natures, and more or less in all natures. It is an important element in any broad view of the question of international arbitration.

There are alleviating elements. There is a tendency toward creating a brotherhood among the working classes, which will raise strong objections against their being drafted into military service and shot down. This might prevent a war even between France and Germany. Industrial organizations may aid much in the solution of this question.

We shall also have to study the question of what might be the result of disbanding the great armies of the world and how it may be most satisfactorily accomplished. These points and many others which will present themselves indicate that the time is ripe for the consideration

of arbitration as a practical question. It is a large question. If we can not do much with it as individuals, we may do much together. This Conference ought to accelerate in some degree the great movement towards substituting reason for brute force and passion as the controlling power in human affairs.

THE CHAIRMAN.

THE CHAIRMAN in closing the session said that recently there was pending in the legislature of Pennsylvania a bill providing for military education in the public schools. A deputation of strong, intelligent men went to the capital to protest against such an enactment. They found their labors greatly aided by those of the labor element. The arguments of the representatives of the labor unions were so convincing and so influential with the politicians that the efforts of the philanthropists were much lightened.

The session then closed.

## SECOND SESSION.

WEDNESDAY EVENING, JUNE 5.

At the opening of the evening session a number of letters were read from persons unable to be present. Most of these expressed hearty sympathy with the purpose for which the Conference had been called.

ADDRESS OF PHILIP C. GARRETT.

MR. PHILIP C. GARRETT was the first speaker. He said that his interest in the subject dated from the time when he was drafted during the civil war. Being a non-resistant, if an unknown friend had not paid the commutation money for him, he might have been dragged into the field and subjected to a severe test of his principles. He had then considered carefully the foundation of his convictions, had afterwards attended the meetings of some of the Congresses in Europe and other bodies, and had learned that the real difficulty was the absence of a sense of international justice. He had introduced at the Frankfurt Congress a resolution that small powers should be considered as having equal rights with larger ones. This resolution was treated with contempt. He was bound to believe that the British Government still believes that might makes right and continually encroaches upon small powers. This lack of the sense of justice was a great obstacle.

He thought there were two better methods than arbitration for settling disputes. The first was by union as in the case of the States of Germany and Italy. The most signal instance of this was the United States, the difficulties between whose States are settled by courts. The second method was negotiation, by the officials of the two countries themselves. A better method still would be the establishment of a court like the Supreme Court of the United States. William Penn two centuries ago in "An Essay towards the Peace of Europe" had proposed this to the nations of Europe. But it was too early. Though a Friend, William Penn proposed that this arrangement be backed up by force, each State to furnish a certain contingent, which force, however, he thought would never have to be used. In reply to a question of Judge Earl's as to how this differed from arbitration, he said that he considered arbitration a temporary submission of a case to a temporary tribunal. He gave an interesting statement of the way in which the German Emperor had not long ago made an appeal to the European nations for a simultaneous reduction of armaments.

EDWARD EVERETT HALE'S ADDRESS.

DR. HALE said that the United States is the most successful peace society which the world has ever known. This association beginning with thirteen independent States, proud of their independency, with the acquisitions since made, had furnished the extraordinary spectacle of one hundred and six years of peace, broken only by the calamity of the Civil War, which was itself a very strong argument in the line we are pursuing. The principles of William Penn and of Henry IV. in his "Great Design" are illustrated to the letter in the history of the United States.

Nothing of this, however, has got into the histories. History as a rule puts in only what is noisy. It would surprise most schools and colleges if you should tell them that in 105 years there have been thirty or forty conflicts, settled by the Supreme Court, which under ordinary circumstances would have led to a shock of arms. The boundary dispute between Massachusetts and Rhode Island was a case in point, yet not fifty men or women in either of the two States now knew anything about it. The Supreme Court does its work so quietly that it does not get into print. Its existence is now and then announced with extraordinary fanfaronade in Europe; it takes them entirely by surprise. But the Supreme Court is virtually the head of our government.

Why was not Henry IV. right in proposing a United States of Europe? Why not have a Permanent Tribunal to which all questions now leading to war might be referred? He thought arbitration ought to be interpreted in the larger sense in which it is used in literature. "Leave it out to men," as they say in New England. That scheme has brought about nearly eighty settlements since 1815, and a very good scheme it is. But the world has got beyond the method of creating a court for every separate occasion. In a permanent court there is no possibility of the judges being selected with reference to the particular subject in hand. He urged, therefore, first, second, last and always a permanent tribunal. That must be "rubbed in" to the public mind, that people might dream of it at night and think of it in the morning. A Permanent Bicycle was much better than to have to make a new one every time you go out to ride.

This was considered visionary in Henry IV.'s time and William Penn's, but a hundred years later came along the United States and made a great success of it, for seventy millions of people now. Nobody dares now to call it dreamy. It is better than war, better than diplomacy. Dr. Hale then briefly outlined a plan for a court to be set up by the six Great Powers, and something of the way in which it should work. Such a court would require no army behind it to support its decisions. Public opinion would be sufficient. Not an ounce of powder had ever been burned in the whole course of the jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court.

A Permanent Tribunal would keep together a body of men who understood their business, and a body of intelligible international law would grow up. Since the time of Adam there has been nobody to say what international law is. The United States ought to propose to the other nations the establishment of such a court.

The passion for war was not a passion of the men who create the wealth of the world and if we could propose a practical system, we should have the working, the creative force of the world behind us.

## ADDRESS OF JUDGE ROBERT EARL.

JUDGE ROBERT EARL of the New York Court of Appeals, being introduced, said that public opinion ruled the world and war would never cease till we had a public sentiment imperiously demanding its cessation. Notwithstanding all peace efforts he had observed that militarism was more rampant than it had ever been in his day, except during the war. This had been manifested in connection with Hawaii and the Spanish war-vessel and the Nicaragua trouble. Our navy must be enlarged. There was great glorification whenever a war-vessel was launched. Our army ought to be enlarged, to make it worthy of a great Republic! We needed no army he thought, except for police purposes. The friends of peace ought to set their face against any increase. There was still a good deal of the worship of the warlike among us. We made pets of all men, good or bad, who had been engaged on the side of the North. They must have all the best places. We had special days on which to foster this spirit. Not all these things should be condemned, but the war spirit should be counteracted.

We should promote commerce between the nations. Commerce was the great civilizer. For the present it might be necessary to erect tariff barriers, but some day commerce would be as free as between these States. "Commercial dependence is the greatest security for national independence."

In international arbitration the first thing was to settle individual cases, between two nations, by temporary courts. In this way the public mind would be educated. In process of time a permanent Court of Arbitration would be reached. But before that a great many difficulties would have to be surmounted. There would be difficulties between the larger and the smaller powers about representation—such difficulties as nearly wrecked the efforts to form a constitution for this country. This great tribunal would, however, sometime be erected, and there would not be the least difficulty in enforcing its decisions. Public sentiment, as in the case of the many arbitrations already cited, would so press upon the nations that they would not dare to disregard any decision.

## REMARKS OF JOSHUA L. BAILY.

MR. JOSHUA L. BAILY said that the settlement of difficulties between nations by some method other than that of war seemed to him inevitable, from business considerations. These considerations were contributing even more than moral considerations. Anyone engaged in mercantile pursuits had opportunity to observe how the lines of demarcation between nations were being gradually obliterated. Countries once far apart were now neighbors. War was therefore to become impossible.

Science also was bringing about the same result in another way. War in the future would mean annihilation not conquest. With the new implements of war, no nation would dare to bring on a conflict.

Nothing could be done without the support of public sentiment. This, as Judge Earl had shown, was now being educated in the wrong direction.

It was a cause of sorrow and alarm to see the military spirit spreading over the land. The character of the books in the hands of the students was wrong. The errors which were abroad must be corrected by the teachers at their fountain-head.

## REMARKS OF HON. WM. H. ARNOUX.

JUDGE ARNOUX remarked that Dr. Hale, like one of the old prophets, looked into the future and saw what would inevitably come. But evolution must do its work first. A committee ought to be appointed to urge the government of the United States to make a treaty with every power of the world, big or little, providing that all their differences should be submitted to some tribunal. All the powers of Europe he thought would be ready to join with us. That would be a great object-lesson, and would certainly result in bringing about a permanent tribunal.

A resolution was unanimously passed that the Business Committee be authorized to print the proceedings of the Conference and that the treasurer be authorized to invite contributions to the amount of four hundred dollars for that purpose.

The session adjourned at 9.30 P.M.

## THIRD SESSION.

THURSDAY MORNING, JUNE 6.

THE CHAIRMAN on calling the Conference to order announced that the subject for the morning was the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain. The first speaker introduced was Hon. Robert Treat Paine of Boston.

## ADDRESS OF HON. ROBERT TREAT PAINE.

MR. PAINE said that the movement for this treaty only needed to be appreciated by us to succeed. The subject did not differ very widely from that considered the evening before. A treaty between two nations was the first step, a high court of arbitration between all was the last.

The movement for a treaty between this country and Great Britain had proceeded by triennial steps. The first was in 1887 when a deputation of thirteen Englishmen brought to the President of the United States a memorial signed by two hundred and thirty-three members of the House of Commons. This memorial was cordially received. The next step was in 1890, when on the 3d of April the Sherman Concurrent Resolution was passed by our House of Representatives, requesting the President to open negotiations, as fit occasion might arise, with other nations for the settlement of differences by arbitration. The same year the Pan-American Congress had been meeting in Washington. After reading passages from Mr. Blaine's address on this occasion Mr. Paine said that soon after the adjournment of the Congress Mr. Blaine sent a circular letter to all the civilized nations enclosing a copy of the draft of an arbitration treaty drawn up by the Congress, inviting them to join us in the proposed treaty. No immediate practical results, however, came of this official action of our State Department. The next step was in 1893. The 16th of June of that year was a great day in our cause. The Cremer resolution with the support and the amendment of Mr. Gladstone passed the House of Commons without a division. This resolution expressed the readiness of the British Parliament to co-operate heartily with any movement from this side of the water.

After reading from the correspondence between Mr. Bayard and Sir Julian Pauncefoot in reference to this resolution, Mr. Paine quoted from the President's message to Congress in December, 1893, in which sympathetic allusion was made to the subject. Since that time but little progress had been made. The Nicaragua matter and others

had rendered the condition of things at Washington unfavorable to further movement. Resolutions had been introduced into both Houses, interviews had been had with members of the Committees on Foreign Affairs and with the State Department, but as yet nothing had been done. He thought the fitting moment would soon come when the two great English-speaking peoples would bind themselves together in a treaty of perpetual peace and amity.

The excellent effects of the treaty of 1817 by which both governments bound themselves not to put war-vessels on the great lakes illustrated in a most practical way what might be expected from the proposed treaty of arbitration.

He was greatly encouraged at seeing the class of men and women present at this Conference. It was not a local interest which called them together. The press he was sure was with us—the Boston press, the New York press, the Philadelphia press, as had been made evident when Mr. Cremer recently brought to Washington a second memorial signed by 354 members of Parliament. The pulpit also was on our side. A determined effort would secure the result which they all had so much at heart.

MR. PHILIP C. GARRETT then moved that a Committee be appointed to visit Washington after the close of the Conference and appeal to the government for the furtherance of this movement. He thought that great progress had been made since 1887. The resolution was referred to the Business Committee.

#### ADDRESS OF PROFESSOR GEORGE H. EMMOTT.

PROFESSOR GEORGE H. EMMOTT was next introduced and said that it had been most clearly demonstrated that the larger part of the electorate of Great Britain strongly desired a *permanent* treaty of arbitration between that country and this. He read in full the memorial recently brought to Washington by Mr. Cremer, and called attention to the fact that it was signed not only by many prominent Liberals, but also by Liberal-Unionists and by distinguished Conservatives. He did not hesitate, speaking as an Englishman, to say that this memorial expressed the heartfelt sentiment of a large part both of the House of Commons and of the British electorate. The memorial did not proceed from the British Government. It was not signed by members of the Cabinet. It was a movement of the masses of the British people whose interests were one with those of the people of the United States. The speaker had been brought up in the North of England in close contact with the laboring classes, and he knew that their feelings towards the people of the United States are different from what they are towards any other country. The average Englishman would be extremely unwilling to raise a hand against this country.

The next step towards a treaty would have to be taken by this country. The people of England would not go further, unless encouraged to do so by action on this side of the water. This Convention ought to urge suitable action on the part of the President and Congress.

In England at the present time out of every twenty shillings raised by taxation sixteen and a half shillings went for the support of armaments, past and present. On a recent visit to the library of the British Museum, to look up some topic in comparative jurisprudence, he found that recently published French and German books on the sub-

ject were not there. The government had cut down by fifty thousand dollars the yearly grant made to the library.

We ought to strive for a permanent tribunal, but we ought still more to do the duty next before us. It had taken much laborious effort to bring the people of Great Britain to where they now are. If the present opportunity should go by, international arbitration might receive a long setback. The conclusion of the proposed treaty would give it a great impulse forward. The obstacles in Great Britain were much greater than in this country. The Anglican clergymen lent the sanction of their consecrated office to the military system. It was very important that something should be done *now*. No nobler work could be conceived of than that of bringing these two countries into still closer union.

At the close of Professor Emmott's address Dr. Trueblood offered a resolution inviting him to prepare his address in a suitable form for publication in the press. The resolution was unanimously carried.

After some discussion as to why the British House of Commons did not take more formal action on the subject of the proposed treaty, the chairman introduced Mr. James Wood of Mt. Kisco, N. Y.

#### ADDRESS OF JAMES WOOD.

MR. JAMES WOOD said that the consideration of this subject had been brought to a very practical point. The force of precedent had already made arbitration the law. This must now be put on paper. Precedent was more binding upon the British people than upon us. Both because of precedent and of public opinion he could not conceive of any question arising between the two countries which would result in an appeal to arms. The British government was even more sensitive to public opinion than our own. What was said in the press was not always an indication of public opinion. The press often spoke in the interest of votes. Everybody in this country seemed to be after votes. The recent Jingo utterances of the press of this country in regard to Nicaragua and other places was to be accounted for largely in this way. It was popular to shout against Great Britain in order to get the Irish vote. We should soon have an anti-Italian policy, for the sake of the Italian vote.

The sober judgment of both peoples would condemn a resort to arms between this country and Great Britain. The Anglo-Saxon race was a sensible race. These two nations were Christian nations. A treaty of arbitration was not really needed to prevent war between these two countries. But such a treaty would powerfully promote the peace of the world. The English-speaking peoples were soon to rule the world. Peoples of all races brought into the Anglo-Saxon household soon became essentially Anglo-Saxon. The great mold in this country was the public school. Though brought up strictly to believe that all war was wrong, he (the speaker) gradually got the idea when he entered the public school that there was one exception—that it was a sacred duty to fight England. This sentiment in the schools had largely changed.

If England and the United States entered into this treaty, the other nations would follow—Germany first perhaps. Russia and France might not follow at once but other nations would. The realization of our dream would come, and come with a rush.



The Committee to go to Washington was a wise one. We must attack the government at the head—and also at the tail. A man in Congress always wanted to be re-elected, and you could move him. Everybody must besiege the man in Congress, in the interest of this movement.

ADDRESS OF HON. GEORGE S. HALE.

HON. GEORGE S. HALE, being introduced, said that he did not agree with those who drew a distinction between arbitration and treaties and tribunals. Arbitration was simply the determination of a controversy by impartial third parties. The whole system of civilization rested on compulsory arbitration. There must be compulsory negotiation. Government must say to two opposing parties: "Pause; agree with thine adversary quickly, while thou art in the way with him, lest he deliver thee to the officer and the officer cast thee into prison." That was the first step in all legislation by treaty. The great powers must lay their hands on those threatening to go to war and compel them to shake hands.

The next thing was to invite, not to compel, submission to a court, as was done in Massachusetts in the case of the Board of Railroad Commissioners and the State Board of Arbitration. In the case of the former, their friendly recommendation had always been accepted, and that of the latter in numerous instances.

If negotiation failed, we should compel submission to an able, impartial board of men. The great powers should join together and not let any nations fight until they had submitted their controversy to an impartial tribunal.

All should use their earnest efforts to bring Great Britain and the United States into the proposed treaty relations. Now was "the accepted time." The public opinion of the best portion of the community was right on the subject.

ADDRESS OF HON. CHARLES R. SKINNER.

MR. SKINNER, being called upon, said that as he understood the matter the President and Secretary of State were authorized to proceed in this negotiation, and also to invite other nations besides Great Britain to join us. It was not necessary to go to Congress and wait upon Committees. The President would be sustained by the public spirit of this country.

The Nicaragua canal, if it commended itself to the business interests of the world, would be built. It would benefit Great Britain as well as this country. We ought to have less material selfishness and no more anglophobia. We were great and strong enough to love every nation.

The kindly feeling of Great Britain for this country had been exhibited on one memorable occasion, when the Queen gave the ship *Alert*, fully equipped, to the United States to be sent in search of the lost Greely Expedition. He had never seen the Congress of the United States so affected as when the announcement of the Queen's gift was made in the body.

We were not a nation of barbarians, but an enlightened Christian nation. He believed that the spirit of every English-speaking people was in favor of peace and not of war. If the press and the pulpit were with us, the public school system should also soon be.

HON. JACOB LEFEVRE, member of Congress, being asked to speak, declined as he had just come in. Being

asked by Mr. Garrett whether he agreed with Mr. Skinner that the State Department should go forward without awaiting further action by Congress, he replied that he thought the matter needed the impulse of the people through Congress, and that Congress would be found ready to do anything that would aid the movement.

REMARKS OF DR. BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD.

DR. TRUEBLOOD, being asked to close the discussion, said that during a visit to Washington the past winter he found the impression prevailing that the State Department was sufficiently authorized by previous action of Congress to proceed to negotiate this treaty, but that many were of opinion that the cause would be greatly stimulated by a further voice from the Representatives of the people.

He had been reminded while others were speaking that we had had no war with Great Britain for eighty-one years. During this time the two countries had settled ten important controversies by arbitration. Peaceful settlement was the rule between them. He accepted with the utmost faith the statement made several times during the morning that there never would be another war of any kind between the two countries, whatever the alarmists and Jingoists might do.

There were, however, two dangers to the peace between them and two obstacles in the way of the proposed treaty. One was the growing prevalence of the spirit of militarism. This was primarily due to the warlike instincts inherited from the civil war. The spirit manifested itself in two different lines; first, in an extreme sensitiveness or disposition to take offence, coupled with a growing desire for territorial extension; secondly, in the restless wish to have all the boys of the country, in school and church, trained in the arts of war.

Another danger and obstacle was the misunderstanding of the source in England from which comes the proposal for this treaty. There was great ignorance on each side of the water of the condition and spirit of the people on the other. The impression prevailed at Washington that the British government through this treaty was seeking to tie our hands in order that she may carry on her territory-grabbing schemes without interference from us. But the movement for this treaty did not originate with the British government. It had had to meet the indifference and the opposition of the government at every step. It originated with and was a movement of the people. It sought to tie the hands of the British government as well as of our own, to prevent that government from continuing its iniquitous colonial policy, its aggressions on weak peoples. This false impression of the origin of the movement of this treaty ought to be corrected. It was doing immense mischief. No more wicked thing could be done than to create ill-feeling and misunderstanding between these two English-speaking peoples.

This treaty ought to be made before the century closes. The Conference ought to throw the whole weight of its influence upon this point. The treaty once signed, Germany would come into the agreement. France also would come. The French and American peoples, never having had any war, were as near together in spirit as the British and the American. This treaty would do much for the speedy destruction of the whole war system.

The session then closed.

CONCLUDED NEXT MONTH.